

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/511,103	,10/14/2004	Kari J Niemi	60091.00348	9602	
32294	7590 03/29/2006		EXAMINER		
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. 14TH FLOOR 8000 TOWERS CRESCENT TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182			BALAOING, ARIEL A		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2617		
			DATE MAILED: 03/29/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/511,103	NIEMI, KARI J	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ariel Balaoing	2617	

	Ariel Balaoing	2617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 March 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF			
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI	g date of the final rejecti	ion.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		I36(a) and the appropria	te extension fee
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com	oliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two mont	hs of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	ne appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		IE Delow);	
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be</li> </ul>		ducina or cimplifyina	the issues for
appeal; and/or	tter form for appear by materially re	ducing or sumplinying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		,	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		•	` ,
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is profile that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-20. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ill be entered and an	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affidar	lotice of Appeal will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a (1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered b <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ince because:
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s)	
13.	Qlov	ge log.	

GEORGE ENG SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding independent claims 1, 7, 12, and 19, the applicant argues "that Sonti fails to disclose or suggest at least the feature of maintaining a value on at least two different levels for a least a first parameter, the first level being a system or service-specific level and the second level being a subscription-specific level in which a parameter value is separately defined for each subscription in the system." (see page 13 of the remarks); the examiner respectfully disagrees. From Figure 4, the two different levels can be seen. The first level represents a service [feature] of a subscriber (feature list 1, 2, and 3; 364a, 364b, and 364c), while the second level being subscription-specific 352, 372.

Furthermore, the applicant argues "Sonti merely discloses that a subscriber may choose one of a plurality of feature lists as an active feature list i.e., as an active profile. ... . Sonti, at best mentions that a subscriber may select a different list for different times of days or geographic areas. Further, Applicants submit that the geographic location is not more individualized than the time of day, as alleged on page 2, of the Office Action." (see page 13 of the remarks); the examiner respectfully disagrees. Individualizing of a feature is to modify the feature to suit the needs of a particular individual, therefore time of day and geographic location indicates the feature being more individualized i.e., modified to suit the needs of the individual. It can be seen in the abstract that these features are also individualized for a plurality of subscribers.

Furthermore, it is noted that amended claim 1 has removed the limitation "the first level being more individualizing than the second level".

Furthermore, the applicant argues "Sonti fails to mention, disclose or suggest maintaining different profiles for a service" (see page 14 of the remarks); the examiner respectfully disagrees. From Figure 4a, feature lists 364a, 364b, 364c are shown which maintain different profiles for a service.

AB 3/10/2006